DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 960 CS 502 920

AUTHOR Slater, Dan; Elliott, William R.
TITLE Distinguishing Facts From Fictions: Television's Influence on Adolescents' Knowledge of Law Enforcement.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (71st, Ocean City, MD, April 24-26, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Crime; Delinquency; *Law Enforcement; Perception; Police; Programing (Broadcast); Secondary Education; Secondary School Students; *Television Research; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Media Effects

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire survey was conducted to discern the effect of television police/crime programs on adolescents' knowledge of real life law enforcement activities. The sample population was composed of 313 average high school students, 160 students involved in a "positive" police situation through taking courses taught by police officers, and 84 students with "negative" police interactions (having records of law violation or delinquency). The questionnaire elicited information on television viewing habits and knowledge of real life law enforcement. Six items were used to test knowledge, each having a "TV" answer and a "real life" answer. The subjects were divided into categories of light, moderate, and heavy television viewers of law enforcement television programs. The hypothesis that as viewing level increased, the ability of a subject to discern fact from fiction would decrease was partially supported by the findings. The results also suggested that the influence of television as an instructor of statistics about law enforcement might not be significant, but that the influence of television's repetitious portrayal of certain police methods and behaviors might have an impact on adolescents' perceptions of social reality. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED186960

Distinguishing Facts From Fictions: Television's Influence on Adolescents' Knowledge of Law Enforcement

Dan Slater
William R. Elliott

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dan Slater
William R. Elliott
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mass Communication Interest Group
Eastern Communication Association
Ocean City, Maryland
April 24-26, 1980

Dan Slater is Assistant Professor
of Speech Communication at
The Pennsylvania State University

William R. Elliott is Director
of the Communication Research Center
at the University of Oregon

The authors wish to thank Sigma Xi-The Scientific Research Society of North America for financial assistance in this study.

CS502920

Distinguishing Facts From Fictions:
Television's Influence on Adolescents'
Knowledge of Law Enforcement

ABSTRACT

Many law enforcement officials and media researchers long have decried the distorted images of law enforcement and police operations routinely presented on prime-time TV police/crime programs. Scholars have believed that information derived from "indirect" sources such as television have influenced an audience's "social reality." This influence may be particularly acute for adolescents. Prior research on the relationship between youth and police has been attitudinal. Only recently has there been research concerned with the influence of television on knowledge of law enforcement and this paper concerns this area of inquiry.

Specifically, the authors are concerned with the effect of TV police/crime programs on adolescents' knowledge of real-life law enforcement and their ability to discern the TV "facts" from the real-life facts. A sample of adolescents were provided a questionnaire on viewing habits and knowledge of real-life law enforcement. Six items were used to test knowledge, each having the "TV Answer" vs. "Real-Life Answer" choices of the type utilized by Gerbner. The sample was divided into the categories of light, moderate, and heavy viewers of law enforcement-oriented TV programs. Control variables were gender, grades, economic status, and direct experience with police. The latter variable was determined by pre-selecting the sample from among three groups: average high school students, students involved in a "positive" police situation through taking courses taught by police officers, and high school age students with a history of "negative" police interactions, i.e. delinquents. The authors hypothesized that as viewing level increased, the ability to discern the facts from the fictions decreased.

The major finding of the study, as a result of the hypothesis being partially supported, is that some types of knowledge questions may be more effective in determining an audience's social reality. Those items in which respondents were asked to choose from answers involving numerical or statistical descriptions were not significant. Questions for which the answer choices involved "images" produced significant differences among light and heavy viewers. The influence of television as an instructor of statistics about law enforcement may not be significant. But the influence of television's repetitious portrayal of certain police methods and behaviors may very well impact an audience's social reality.

For many years police and law enforcement officials have attacked the television industry for the distorted images of law enforcement and police operations which are routinely presented in prime-time entertainment programming. Many essays and opinion pieces written by police chiefs and law enforcement specialists have discussed the apparent distortions in such programs as "Starsky and Hutch," "Police Woman," "Baretta," and other highly rated police/crime shows of recent years.[1] Even private detectives have spoken out against the gross distortions evident in the behaviors of their television counterparts.[2]

Media researchers concerned with images of law enforcement presented on television have conducted, for the most part, content analyses in order to determine the number and type of TV law enforcement characters, their traits and behaviors, and the type and amount of crime that is depicted. The general conclusions of these studies are that police/crime shows have been a major focus of programming throughout the history of television and that there is almost no relationship between TV police/crime action and real-world occurrences.[3]

Although most of the police/law enforcement essayists and media researchers have expressed concern over the potentially harmful effects of these distorted images, few researchers specifically have addressed the question of what effect TV police/crime programs have on the public's knowledge of law enforcement activities. To examine the impact of television, we surveyed a sample of high school students regarding their exposure to TV police/crime programs and their knowledge of real-life law enforcement.

A number of scholars and researchers have been concerned about the influence of mass media on the formation of our knowledge and view of the world. Walter Lippmann, writing in 1922, worried that media reports created a "pseudo-environment" and that the public based their opinions and actions on that "indirect information" rather than on direct contact.[4] Later, Boulding suggested that our behavior is governed by the image we have of the world, an image which may or may not be congruent with reality.[5]

In a comprehensive review of this area of inquiry, McLeod and Chaffee further develop the concept of "social reality."[6] They, like Lippmann and Boulding, distinguish between direct and indirect sources of information and note that most of what we know about the world comes from indirect sources. Thus, they define social reality as "the extent that one's definition of a situation is derived from communications with other people rather than from his direct experience."[7] For us, social reality is used to mean the degree that one's definition of an event is influenced by information not from the event itself but indirectly from information transmitted through an intermediary such as a mass medium. What makes this "indirect information" significant is that it is often given the status of reality even though it usually remains unverified by direct, personal contact with the event, situation, or environment.

In some cases, distorted images about a subject presented on the most powerful of all indirect information sources--television--can be offset by direct experience with the particular subject matter. This solution for law enforcement subject matter is not, as a practical matter, attainable. Since relatively few in our society have had direct experience with law enforcement, except perhaps for a traffic violation,[8] the public has relied upon television as their primary, albeit indirect, source of information about police and law enforcement activities.

Only recently have researchers begun conducting quantitative studies focusing on the effect which viewing of television has on the development of adolescents' social reality with regard to law enforcement. Rarick, Townsend, and Boyd's research suggests that for the groups of youth surveyed "there is a widespread belief that television police are idealized dramatizations different from reality." Further, their sample of adolescent delinquents perceived television police in the same way as non-delinquents. The delinquents did not appear to have more negative views of police than their law-abiding peers.[9]

Teevan and Hartnagel analyzed data from a Maryland junior and senior high school sample. They found weak but statistically significant relationships between the subjects' perception of their favorite television program as violent or nonviolent and their perceptions of neighborhood crime, frequency of money being taken from students in school, frequency of weapons carried by students in school, and the frequency of fights in school. Very similar patterns were observed for subjects who perceived the violence used in their favorite shows as effective. However, when the data were analyzed to determine the association between the objective violence rating of the subjects' four favorite programs and the subjects' perceptions of crime, the relationship was not statistically significant. Teevan and Hartnagel note that for their sample there is little relationship between exposure to

television violence and their measures of crime perception. They conclude that television appears to play only a small part in explaining perceptions of crime among the adolescents sampled.[10]

Perhaps the most well-known research in this area has been conducted by George Gerbner and Larry Gross and their "Cultural Indicators" team at the Annenberg School of Communications of the University of Pennsylvania. They discuss the law enforcement issue as part of their broader inquiry "into the assumptions television cultivates about the facts, norms, and values of society."[11] In their initial research, Gerbner and Gross presented to an adult sample a series of questions with only two possible answer choices: a "TV" answer representing life as it is depicted on television, and a "Real Life" answer which was more closely aligned with actual fact. They asked two questions relevant to the police/law enforcement discussion. First, "What percent of all males who have jobs work in law enforcement and crime detection?" The answer choices were "1%" (Real Life Answer) or "5%" (TV Answer). They found that heavy viewers of television (four or more hours per day) tended to overestimate the percentage of law enforcement personnel in society as compared to light viewers by a margin of 59% to 50%. They also asked, "During any given week, what are your chances of being involved in some type of violence?" For that question the answer choices were "One in Ten" (TV Answer) or "One in a Hundred" (Real Life Answer).[12] Again, heavy viewers gave the TV Answer more than light viewers by a count of 52% to 39%.[13]

Their most recent research utilized the same approach but focused on an adolescent sample. For example, they asked a group of adolescents in New Jersey the question, "Think about the number of people who are involved in violence each week. Do you think one person out of every 100 is involved in some kind of violence in any given week, or is it closer to 10 people out of every 100?" They again found that heavy viewers overestimated the "chances" of involvement

in violence by giving the TV Answer of "ten out of a hundred" significantly more often than the light viewers.[14] Gerbner and Gross note that "television viewing also seems to contribute to adolescents' images and assumptions about law enforcement procedure and activities" and conclude that "these findings provide considerable support for the conclusion that heavy television viewers perceive social reality differently from light television viewers, even when other factors are held constant."[15]

Despite the seeming persuasiveness of Gerbner and Gross' findings, subsequent research suggests alternative conclusions. Wober failed to replicate their findings in a study in England, although that research was structured somewhat differently.[16] Doob and Macdonald's study paralleled the Gerbner/Gross approach more closely. The reported results for their total sample supported the heavy viewing/light viewing thesis.[17] However, when Doob and Macdonald looked at the results for each of their four groups of subjects (residents in a high and low crime area in a "city" and a high and low crime area in a "suburb"), they found that "there is essentially no relationship between media usage and fear of crime when the effect of neighborhood is removed."[18] The level of actual crime in the neighborhood was the variable of importance, not television viewing level.

The study by Doob and Macdonald and the study by Teevan and Hartnagel suggest that the straightforward exposure-to-perception hypothesis of the Gerbner/Gross model may conceal as much as it explains. In addition to our concern that other variables probably have an important part in explaining the differences between light and heavy television viewers, we feel the Gerbner and Gross classification into light and heavy viewers, without regard to program content, is too imprecise a measuring tool to tap the influence of a particular program type on the audience's perception of that subject area, e.g. the effect of law enforcement programs on perceptions of real-life law enforcement activities.

Although Gerbner and Gross' research is open to some criticism, that does not alter our conclusion that their general approach has merit. The influence of such a powerful medium as television should affect the public's perception of a particular subject area, especially when the audience has not had an opportunity to experience that subject area directly. In addition, the most recent Gerbner and Gross research is important because they present data on adolescents. Their initial research showed that the under-30 age group was consistently more influenced by television than those over 30, and that these results held when controls for education, newspaper reading, and gender were introduced.[19] Their recent study on adolescents shows this same, consistent pattern even when controls for other variables are introduced.[20]

The combination of expressions of concern by law enforcement officials and the Gerbner/Gross and related studies suggest the need of specifically studying the influence of TV law enforcement programs on youth's knowledge of real-life police and law enforcement activities. Unfortunately, there is little research in this area since most of the youth-police research concern youth's attitudes toward police. In Bouma's survey of over 10,000 high school students in Michigan, he asked many attitudinal questions, but reported the results of only one knowledge-oriented question: "Do you think criminals usually get caught?" He reported that 72% said Yes and 15% said No. In reality, according to the FBI statistics Bouma quotes, only 13% of all reported crimes are cleared by arrest and conviction.[21] Dominick sampled a group of fifth graders and reported a significant correlation between viewing of crime shows and a knowledge of arrest rights.[22]

The concern about television's impact on an audience's social reality and the lack of research specifically addressing the issue of the influence of TV law enforcement programs on youth's knowledge of real-life law enforcement led to our study. Our hypothesis is similar to that employed by Gerbner and Gross, namely that as viewing of law enforcement programs increases, the

ability to discern the real-world law enforcement "facts" from the TV-version "facts" decreases.

METHOD

Three classifications of high school students from California and Oregon made up the subject pool. The subjects were differentiated on the degree of direct experience each had with law enforcement agencies. The first group, of "average" high school students, was selected from two California high schools and one Oregon high school. This group was labeled as the "Limited" direct experience group.

The second group of subjects was selected from high schools having formal classes in law enforcement taught by police officers or were selected from agencies sponsoring some type of extra-curricular police/law enforcement program for high school age individuals. Two California high schools and one Police Explorer program in California provided subjects for this group. These students, involved in police classes, were designated as the "Positive" direct experience group.

Two criteria were employed in the selection of the final group. First, they had to have violated the law to such a degree that they had been arrested, convicted, and either incarcerated or placed on probation. Second, they needed to have access to television during prime-time hours at the time the questionnaire was administered. Subjects in this group were located at a half-way house in Oregon, a California high school for students with problems (all subjects used from this school were on probation at the time of the administration), and a California school run by a county juvenile court system. The third group, with a record of law violation and delinquency, was identified as the "Negative" direct experience sample.

There were 313 subjects (56.2%) in the "Limited"(High School) portion,

160 subjects (28.7%) in the "Positive"(Police Class) group, and 84 subjects (15.1%) in the "Negative"(Violators) group. A total of 557 subjects participated in the research project.

Survey research questionnaires were administered to all subjects between March 21 and April 1, 1977. The variables used in the questionnaire are reported below.

Law Enforcement Program Viewing. Subjects were given a program log listing all prime-time network programs, excluding movies and specials. They were asked to check those programs viewed "regularly." Twenty-two of the listed programs featured law enforcement activity of some sort. All law enforcement programs were then summed with each subject receiving a score ranging from zero to twenty-two. The mean score for law enforcement program viewing was 5.9. For the purposes of the analysis, three categories of law enforcement program viewing were created: Light Viewing (0-3 programs per week), Moderate Viewing (4-7 programs per week), and Heavy Viewing (8 or more programs per week).

Relative Grades. No direct measure of intelligence such as I.Q. scores or grade point averages were available. To determine the relative academic standing of each subject in order to utilize some measure of intellectual ability as a control variable, we asked the following question: "How do your grades compare with other students in your grade?" The responses ranged from "Quite a bit below the average" (1) to "Quite a bit above the average" (5). The mean score for relative grades was 3.4.

Relative Economic Status. No direct information on each student's family economic level was available and it was unlikely that students could provide accurate dollar figures on their family's annual income. Therefore, we asked them their perception of how their family compared with other American families. Each was asked, "How would you say your family compares with other

American families economically?" Possible responses ranged from "Quite a bit below the economic average" (1) to "Quite a bit above the economic average" (5). The mean score for this variable was 3.3.

Gender. Subjects were asked to indicate their sex. Males made up 53.3% of the sample (N=297) while females accounted for 43.4% (N=242). The remaining 3.3% (N=18) did not provide gender information.

Direct Experience. Direct experience was determined as indicated in the section treating the sample.

Law Enforcement Questions. As the dependent variable, a series of six questions with Television (TV) vs. Real-Life (R-L) answer choices of the type used by Gerbner and Gross were employed. These questions were designed to test the subjects' ability to discern facts as they exist in the real world from "facts" as they are depicted in the "TV world." Of these six questions, the first two are similar to those used by Gerbner and Gross.[23] The two answer choices are listed with each question.

1. During any given week, what do you think the chances are of you personally being involved in some kind of violence? /One in Ten (R-L) or One in a Hundred (TV)/

2. Of all people who have jobs in the U.S., how many work for police departments? /1% (R-L) or 5% (TV)/

3. Who hires private detectives the most? /Private citizens (TV) or Lawyers (R-L)/

4. Private detectives work on what kind of case the most? /Missing persons and accident/injury cases (R-L) or Murder and other criminal cases (TV)/

5. What is the most often used form of police patrol in the U.S.?
/One police officer patrolling alone in a car (R-L) or
Two police officers patrolling together in a car (TV)/

6. Last year, how many police officers were killed in the line of duty in the U.S.?
/100 (R-L) or 400 (TV)/

FINDINGS

The results for Law Enforcement Questions are presented utilizing the statistic Cramer's V with each question on a separate table. The data are presented in term of the trichotomy of viewing levels with an analysis of the differences in light and heavy viewers.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Although there is no significant association indicated in Table 1 between viewing and the correct answer across all subjects, the "effect" of law enforcement program viewing does emerge for males and those in the Negative/Violators group--but in the opposite direction. Among the males and those in the Negative/Violators group, it is the light viewers rather than the heavy viewers who responded with the "TV Answer." Females were more likely to show a light/heavy distinction, but the relationship was relatively weak. A parallel pattern occurs for grades. Those with average and below grades watching low levels of law enforcement programming were more likely to give the TV Answer than those average and below students with heavy TV law enforcement diets. Where grades were above average, the pattern was as predicted, with heavy

viewing being associated with greater acceptance of the TV presentation.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Table 2 shows little evidence of a television influence. In fact, the percentage differences indicate that the light viewers gave more "TV" responses than did the heavy viewers; the results, however, are not statistically significant.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Table 3 indicates a stronger influence of television on the results for this knowledge question. For all subjects, heavy viewers were more likely to respond with the "TV Answer" than were light viewers. This pattern was especially strong among the above average students in terms of grades and economic status, and to a lesser degree among males. The percentage differences between light and heavy viewers all are in the predicted direction.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

As in Table 2, there is litte evidence of television's effect for this knowledge question. Fairly weak relationships are found in the economic status and direct experience categories. In both cases these are negative percentage

differences with light viewers selecting the "TV Answer" more than heavy viewers.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

The influence of heavy viewing is apparent for the data of Table 5. On television, police are shown most often riding in their patrol cars in pairs. Not so in real life. Among all subjects, heavy viewers were again the most affected with a particularly strong association appearing in the economic category and to a lesser degree in the direct experience category and among males. Each of the differences in this table is in the predicted direction.

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

In Table 6, the differences are extremely small, usually negative, and statistically insignificant. There is no evidence of any television influence on this variable.

DISCUSSION

A cursory review of our findings might lead to the conclusion that, at best, the light vs. heavy viewing notion shows a very mixed and inconsistent pattern. This might seem particularly true in light of some instances where the light viewers were the ones selecting the "TV Answers" rather than the heavy viewers.

A more careful analysis, however, indicates that we asked three types of questions about TV vs. Real-Life police activities. Our first question dealt with the probability of the subject being involved in "some kind of violence." If anything, the pattern here was for program viewing to be negatively related to the probability of involvement in violence. For this particular age group, it may be that the more passive young people are the ones attracted to television while the active, and potentially more aggressive, students engage in other activities, thus decreasing their time spent watching television.

The second type of question asked for a specific identification of some crime statistic. Subjects were asked the percentage of people working for police departments and for the number of police killed during a year. Television programming is very unlikely to provide any answer, correct or incorrect, for this type of question. The influence of television as an instructor of statistics and similar areas of knowledge about police and law enforcement activities may not be significant.

The final type of question asked was directed more at the process and style of law enforcement. Our questions in this area concerned clients for private detectives, types of cases worked on by private detectives, and the number of officers in a patrol car. The support for our hypothesized relationship between law enforcement program viewing and the ability to discern the facts from the fictions was found on two of these three questions. Viewing law enforcement programs did seem to be associated with selecting private citizens as the clients for private detectives and with selecting two-police-officer-patrols as the norm. If a learning process is involved, it seems to be in areas where learning may result from observing these continual types of TV actions over a period of time. Thus, television's influence on the audience's social reality with regard to law enforcement may result from the repetitious portrayal of certain methods, relationships, and behaviors depicted

in TV police/crime programs.

Our research suggests that a complex process is in operation. Prior research which utilizes levels of exposure to television as a general measure suggests certain conclusions about the role of television in influencing our social reality. Research which utilizes exposure to particular program types and research which attempts to determine the influence of other variables suggest that exposure to television is but one variable among many influencing social reality. Finally, with the conclusion of this research that television's influence on social reality may be limited to a certain area or type of knowledge, the model may indeed be more complex than first thought. Therefore, further research on television's influence on social reality is needed in order to draw more confident conclusions about television's actual impact in shaping our knowledge and view of the world.

REFERENCES

1 Robert Daley, "Police Report on the TV Cop Shows," New York Times Magazine (November 19, 1972), pp. 39+84-9; "Interview with Pierce R. Brooks," Eugene Living Magazine (June 1977), pp. 10-13; Thomas Gallagher, "View from the 44th Precinct," Saturday Review (March 19, 1977), pp. 16-7; Stacey J. Smith, "A Policewoman Draws a Bead on 'Police Woman'--and Finds Angie Missing the Mark," US Magazine (November 30, 1976), pp. 40-3; Ed Zuckerman, "Prime-Time Patrol: The Year of the COP," Rolling Stone (April 21, 1977), pp. 56-63.

2 John Camper, "Eyeing TV's Private Eyes," TV Magazine, Sunday Portland Oregonian (March 14, 1976), p. 17; Nicholas Pileggi, "Secrets of a Private Eye," New York Magazine (October 4, 1976), pp. 38-45.

3 Stephen Arons and Ethan Katsh, "How TV Cops Flout the Law," Saturday Review (March 19, 1977), pp. 11-18; Robert K. Baker and Sandra J. Ball, eds., Mass Media and Violence, Vol. IX: A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969); Melvin DeFleir, "Occupational Roles as Portrayed on Television," Public Opinion Quarterly, 27(Spring 1964), 57-64; Joseph Dominick, "Crime and Law Enforcement on Prime-Time Television," Public Opinion Quarterly 37(Summer 1973), 241-250; Sydney Head, "Content Analysis of Television Drama Programs," Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television 9(1954), 175-194; Dallas Smythe, "Reality as Presented by TV," Public Opinion Quarterly 18(1954), 143-156; Zuckerman, op cit.

4 Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1922).

5 Kenneth Boulding, The Image (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1956).

6 Jack M. McLeod and Steven H. Chaffee, "The Construction of Social Reality," in James T. Tedeschi, ed., The Social Influence Process (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1972), pp. 50-99.

7 Ibid., p. 51.

8 Daley, p. 39.

9 David L. Rarick, James E. Townsend, and Douglas A. Boyd, "Adolescent Perceptions of Police: Actual and As Depicted in TV Drama," Journalism Quarterly (Autumn 1973), 438-446.

10 James J. Teevan, Jr. and Timothy F. Hartnagel, "The Effect of Television Violence on the Perceptions of Crime by Adolescents," Sociology and Social Research 60:3(April 1976), 337-348.

11 George Gerbner and Larry Gross, "Living with Television: The Violence Profile," Journal of Communication 26(Spring 1976), 182.

12 In his book, Crime in America (1970), former Attorney General Ramsey Clark estimates that in 1967 the chance of being involved in a violent crime as as victim on any given day was 1 in 146,000.

13 see Gerbner and Gross (1976), 189-192.

14 George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Nancy Signorielli, Michael Morgan, and Marilyn Jackson-Beeck, "The Demonstration of Power: Violence Profile No. 10," Journal of Communication 29:3(Summer 1979), 185-196.

15 Ibid., 193.

16 J. M. Wober, "Television Violence and Paranoid Perception: The View from Great Britain," Public Opinion Quarterly 42(Fall 1978), 315-321.

17 Anthony N. Doob and Glenn E. Macdonald, "Television Viewing and Fear of Victimization: Is the Relationship Causal?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 37:2(1979), 170-179.

18 Ibid., 173.

19 Gerbner and Gross (1976), 193.

20 Gerbner et. al. (1979), 193.

21 Donald H. Bouma, Kids and Cops: A Study in Mutual Hostility, (Grand Rapids: William E. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1969), p. 60.

22 Joseph R. Dominick, "Children's Viewing of Crime Shows and Attitudes on Law Enforcement," Journalism Quarterly 51(Spring 1974), 5-12.

23 see Gerbner and Gross (1976).

TABLE 1

Percent responding "One in Ten" (TV Answer) to the question "During any given week what do you think the chances are of you personally being involved in some kind of violence?"

	Law Enforcement Program Viewing			Difference % Heavy - % Light	Cramer's V
	Light (N=163)	Moderate (N=212)	Heavy (N=161)		
Overall (N=536)	50%	50%	47%	- 3	.03
controlling for:					
Gender					
Male (N=295)	67%	47%	46%	-21	.19***
Female (N=241)	37%	53%	48%	+11	.15*
Grades					
Average and Below (N=302)	60%	54%	42%	-18	.14*
Above Average (N=220)	37%	44%	56%	+19	.15*
Economic Status					
Average and Below (N=309)	51%	53%	47%	- 4	.11
Above Average (N=213)	46%	47%	47%	+ 1	.01
Direct Experience					
Limited (High School) (N=287)	46%	39%	45%	- 1	.06
Positive (Police Class) (N=158)	49%	53%	49%	0	.04
Negative (Violators) (N=76)	67%	79%	47%	-20	.29**

* p LE .10
** p LE .05
*** p LE .01

TABLE 2

Percent responding "5%" (TV Answer) to the question "Of all the people who have jobs in the U.S., how many work for police departments?"

	Law Enforcement Program Viewing			Difference % Heavy - % Light	Cramer's V
	Light (N=161)	Moderate (N=212)	Heavy (N=160)		
Overall (N=534)	39%	32%	33%	- 6	.07
controlling for:					
Gender					
Male (N=295)	34%	26%	27%	- 7	.07
Female (N=239)	42%	40%	42%	0	.02
Grades					
Average and Below (299)	44%	34%	39%	- 5	.08
Above Average (N=220)	31%	28%	22%	- 9	.08
Economic Status					
Average and Below (N=306)	42%	33%	36%	- 6	.08
Above Average (N=214)	33%	29%	28%	- 5	.05
Direct Experience					
Limited (High School) (N=287)	45%	31%	40%	- 5	.12
Positive (Police Class)(N=159)	25%	26%	17%	- 8	.09
Negative (Violators)(N=75)	47%	56%	33%	-14	.20

* p LE .10
** p LE .05
*** p LE .01

TABLE 3

Percent responding "Private citizens" (TV Answer) to the question "Who hires private detectives the most?"

	Law Enforcement Program Viewing			Difference % Heavy - % Light	Cramer's V
	Light (N=163)	Moderate (N=213)	Heavy (N=160)		
Overall (N=536)	50%	57%	66%	+16	.13**
controlling for:					
Gender					
Male (N=296)	47%	54%	64%	+17	.13*
Female (N=240)	53%	60%	70%	+17	.13
Grades					
Average and Below (N=302)	56%	53%	66%	+10	.11
Above Average (N=220)	47%	59%	69%	+22	.18**
Economic Status					
Average and Below (N=309)	53%	54%	63%	+10	.09
Above Average (N=214)	47%	61%	74%	+27	.21**
Direct Experience					
Limited (High School) (N=287)	41%	54%	52%	+11	.11
Positive (Police Class) (N=160)	63%	61%	78%	+15	.15
Negative (Violators) (N=77)	67%	72%	88%	+21	.23

* p LE .10
** p LE .05
*** p LE .01

TABLE 4

Percent responding "Murder & Other Criminal Cases" (TV Answer) to the question "Private detectives work on what kind of case the most?"

	Law Enforcement Program Viewing			Difference % Heavy - % Light	Cramer's V
	Light (N=160)	Moderate (N=210)	Heavy (N=159)		
Overall (N=529)	53%	51%	47%	- 6	.05
controlling for:					
Gender					
Male (N=292)	45%	44%	41%	- 4	.03
Female (N=237)	58%	62%	55%	- 3	.05
Grades					
Average and Below (N=296)	63%	54%	53%	-10	.09
Above Average (N=220)	41%	47%	37%	- 4	.08
Economic Status					
Average and Below (N=304)	49%	50%	51%	+ 2	.01
Above Average (N=212)	61%	51%	40%	-21	.16*
Direct Experience					
Limited (High School) (N=283)	47%	50%	47%	0	.03
Positive (Police Class) (N=158)	66%	49%	44%	-22	.19*
Negative (Violators) (N=75)	56%	71%	48%	- 8	.20

* p LE .10
** p LE .05
*** p LE .01

TABLE 5

Percent responding "Two police officers patrolling together in a car" (TV Answer) to the question "What is the most often used form of police patrol in the U.S.?"

	Law Enforcement Program Viewing			Difference % Heavy - % Light	Cramer's V
	Light (N=157)	Moderate (N=210)	Heavy (N=160)		
Overall (N=527)	55%	51%	65%	+10	.12**
controlling for:					
Gender					
Male (N=292)	60%	49%	63%	+ 3	.13*
Female (N=235)	52%	55%	68%	+16	.14
Grades					
Average and Below (N=295)	56%	55%	66%	+10	.10
Above Average (N=217)	55%	47%	64%	+ 9	.14
Economic Status					
Average and Below (N=302)	53%	53%	69%	+16	.15**
Above Average (N=211)	57%	49%	63%	+ 6	.12
Direct Experience					
Limited (High School) (N=283)	53%	53%	68%	+15	.14*
Positive (Police Class) (N=155)	56%	48%	68%	+12	.15
Negative (Violators) (N=74)	29%	65%	47%	+18	.26*

30

* p LE .10
** p LE .05
*** p LE .01

TABLE 6

Percent responding "400" (TV Answer) to the question
"Last year, how many police officers were killed in the line of duty in the U.S.?"

	Law Enforcement Program Viewing			Difference % Heavy - % Light	Cramer's V
	Light (N=160)	Moderate (N=212)	Heavy (N=160)		
Overall (N=532)	51%	51%	47%	- 4	.04
controlling for:					
Gender					
Male (N=294)	54%	51%	49%	- 5	.04
Female (N=238)	48%	51%	44%	- 4	.05
Grades					
Average and Below (N=299)	43%	49%	42%	- 1	.06
Above Average (N-219)	59%	53%	55%	- 4	.05
Economic Status					
Average and Below (N=305)	51%	51%	45%	- 6	.05
Above Average (N=233)	49%	48%	44%	- 5	.04
Direct Experience					
Limited (High School) (N=284)	53%	51%	48%	- 5	.04
Positive (Police Class) (N=160)	46%	47%	46%	0	.01
Negative (Violators) (N=75)	44%	61%	44%	0	.15

---

* p LE .10
** p LE .05
*** p LE .01